UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE at WINCHESTER

	ORDER	
Defendant.)	
Commissioner of Social Security,)	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,)	
V.)	Judge Mattice
Plaintiff,)	Case No. 4:10-cv-32
JEFFREY HAYES DANIEL,)	

On July 14, 2011, United States Magistrate Judge William B. Mitchell Carter filed his Report and Recommendation [Court Doc. 15] pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Plaintiff timely filed his objections [Court Doc. 16] on July 28, 2011. Defendant did not respond.

The Court has reviewed *de novo* those portion of Magistrate Judge Carter's Report and Recommendation to which an objection has been made. Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 72(b). The Court finds that Plaintiff's objections raise no new arguments but simply reargue issues previously raised in his Brief in Support of Motion for Judgment on Administrative Record [Court Doc. 10] ("Pl.'s Br. in Supp."), which issues were fully addressed in the Report and Recommendation.¹ The Court finds that further analysis of these same arguments would merely be cumulative and is unwarranted in light of Magistrate Judge Carter's well-reasoned and well-supported Report and Recommendation.

¹ In his Objections, Plaintiff makes a number of references – for instance, "the ALJ properly rejected the RFC assessment of Dr. Langenberg" – that seem to refer to statements and individuals not found in this case, let alone relevant. Similar errors occured in other parts of Plaintiff's briefing. (Court Doc. 10, Pl.'s Br. in Supp., 15) ("Ms. Peters Osier's subjective complaints as required by Social Security Ruling 96-4p and 96-7p.") The Court ignores any such references, but notes them insofar as they help demonstrate the careless, repetitious, and insubstantial nature of Plaintiff's Objections.

Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Carter's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations pursuant to § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b). Plaintiff's objections [Court Doc. 16] are **OVERRULED**. Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment on Administrative Record [Court Doc. 9] is **DENIED**, and Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment [Court Doc. 13] is **GRANTED**. The Commissioner's denial of benefits is **AFFIRMED** and the instant action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

A separate judgment will enter. The Clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED this 6th day of September, 2011.

/s/Harry S. Mattice, Jr.
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE